

THE LEGACY OF CYRIL  
AND METHODIUS  
TO THE SOUTHERN SLAVS

GEORGE C. SOULIS

This study is in substance identical with a paper delivered at the Symposium on "The Byzantine Mission to the Slavs: St. Cyril and St. Methodius," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1964.

The author would like to thank his former teacher Professor Roman Jakobson who read the manuscript and called to his attention a number of bibliographical references.

FOR the reflective student of Slavic cultural history, the year 885 marks a turning point of great significance. The death of Methodius in Velehrad that year was followed by the collapse of the work of the Thessalonian brothers in Central Europe. This in turn led to the most important event in the formation of the character of the spiritual and cultural life of the Southern and Eastern Slavs; namely, the expulsion of the disciples of Cyril and Methodius from Moravia by order of Prince Svatopluk, and their eager reception on the part of the Bulgarian ruler Boris.

Thus, Bulgaria saved the fruits of the labor of the two brothers both for the Slavs and for Europe. Had Boris denied protection and encouragement to these carriers of Slavic liturgy and letters who sought refuge in his land, the Moravian mission of the Slavic apostles would have remained a mere episode in the annals of history, and never would have assumed the importance which we attribute to it today.

It is true that to the end of the eleventh century the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition continued to exist in Bohemia and Southern Poland, especially around the Czech Benedictine abbey of Sázava, and that it even witnessed a revival in the fourteenth century at the Monastery of Emmaus in Prague. But the tradition subsequently disappeared from the lands of the former Great Moravian Empire, leaving only a memory which served thereafter as a thread of inspiration, intimately interwoven with the cultural life and national consciousness of the Czechs and the Slovaks.<sup>1</sup>

The same tradition also flourished in Croatia, where, in the form of Glagolism, it assumed the role of a national symbol in the age-old conflict between Slavic and Latin Christianity in the Dalmatian lands. The Glagolitic tradition became the strongest defense of the Croats against Romanization, and has survived to this day—albeit in a meager form—as living proof of the vitality and tenacity of the Cyrillo-Methodian precepts.<sup>2</sup>

If, however, we attach great significance to the Moravian mission today, it is not because of the two specific cases just cited. Rather, it is because of the reception, preservation, and further development of the Cyrillo-Methodian

<sup>1</sup> R. Jakobson, "The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literature," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, 1 (1953), 39-55; B. Havránek, "Počátky slovanského písma a psané literatury v době velkomoravské," *Velká Moravá: Tisíciletá tradice státu a kultury* (Prague, 1963), 77-96, where all the important literature on the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in Moravia and Bohemia is mentioned. Cf. R. Jakobson, "Úvahy o básničtví dovy husitské," *Slово a slovesnost*, 2 (1936), 1 ff.; O. Odložilsk, "Components of the Czechoslovak Tradition," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 23 (1945), 97-106. For the same tradition in Poland, see the most recent study on the subject by K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland* (Rome, 1961; cf. the review by J. Szymański in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 58 [1963], 911-20).

<sup>2</sup> J. Hamm, "Glagolizam i njegovo značenje za Južne Slavene," *Slavia*, 25 (1956), 313-21. Cf. V. Novak, "The Slavonic-Latin Symbiosis in Dalmatia During the Middle Ages," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 32 (1953-4), 8ff.

legacy by Bulgaria, which, in turn, passed it on to the neighboring Serbs and Rumanians, and finally to the Russians, who, from the end of the tenth century, became the main beneficiaries of this heritage.

The story of the events following the death of Methodius in Moravia is far from clear. Our principal source remains the Greek Life of Saint Clement, probably written by the archbishop of Ohrid, Theophylactus, toward the end of the eleventh century, but definitely based on an older Slavic prototype, which is no longer extant.<sup>3</sup> From this source we learn that, in the winter following Methodius' death, a small group of his disciples led by Clement, Nahum, and Angelarius was conducted, under guard, to the Moravian frontier at the Danube, where it was left to seek its own fortune. Clement and his companions came down the Danube, longing to reach Bulgaria, the country that seemed to them the promised land for the work of their teachers, the Slavic apostles.<sup>4</sup> It is not surprising that they chose to go there, for Bulgaria, bordering on the Great Moravian Empire, was the nearest country in which Christianity was closely connected with Byzantium, from where their masters had originally been sent to evangelize the Slavs. Furthermore, there is every indication that Clement himself, and probably others too, were born in Macedonia.<sup>5</sup>

Boris, ruler of a mighty Bulgarian state, had, together with many of his subjects, received baptism from Byzantium in 864.<sup>6</sup> Finally, by 870, after a period of skillful vacillation between Rome and Constantinople during his effort to obtain an independent Church, Boris firmly attached his country to the Eastern Church, thus placing it forever within the orbit of Byzantine culture. In recognizing the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople the Bulgarian Church retained a measure of autonomy.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, to Boris the clergy must have appeared as an instrument of Byzantine political domination, for these men were Byzantine in origin, and Greek became the official language of both Church and State.

This situation may well explain why Boris gladly welcomed the experienced

<sup>3</sup> The best edition of the Life of Saint Clement is by N. G. Tunickij, *Materialy dlja istorii žizni i dejatel'nosti učenikov svv. Kirilla i Mefodija. I. Grečeskoje prostrannoe žitie sv. Klimenta Slovenskogo* (Sergiev Posad, 1918). For the various versions, editions, translations, and commentaries, see Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcia*, I (Berlin, 1957), 555-7, to which should be added A. Milev, *Žitija na sveti Kliment Ochridski* (Sofia, 1961). Recently I. Snegarov ("Les sources sur la vie et l'activité de Clement d'Ochrida," *Byzantinobulgarica*, 1 [1962], 79-119) has again raised the question of the authorship of the Life by claiming, unconvincingly in my opinion, that it cannot be the work of Theophylactus of Ochrid. Cf. M. Kusseff, "St. Clement of Ochrida," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 27 (1948), 193-215; J. Stanislav, *Osudy Cyrila a Metoda a ich učenikov u životě Klimentovom* (Bratislava, 1950); E. Georgiev, *Razsvet na būlgarskata literatura v IX-X v.* (Sofia, 1962), 334-9; *idem*, "Kliment Ochridski," *Istoriya na būlgarskata literatura*, I (Sofia, 1962), 96-111, 428 (bibliography); P. Gautier, "Clément d'Ochrid, évêque de Dragvista," *Revue des études byzantines*, 22 (1964), 199-214.

<sup>4</sup> *Vita Clementis*, XII-XV (Migne, PG, CXXVI, 1216-21).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XXII (Migne, 1228-9), where it is explicitly stated that Clement knew Methodius from early youth. In the shorter Life of Saint Clement, a work attributed to the archbishop of Ohrid, Demetrius Chomatianus (1216-34), we read that Clement τὸ μὲν γένος εἰλκεν ἐκ τῶν Εὐρωπαίων Μυσῶν. (I. Ivanov, *Būlgarski starini iz Makedonija* [Sofia, 1931], 316-7). Cf. F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome aux IX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1926), 314, note 2.

<sup>6</sup> A. Vaillant and M. Lascaris, "La date de la conversion des Bulgares," *Revue des études slaves*, 13 (1933), 5ff.

<sup>7</sup> V. Zlatarski, *Istoriya na būlgarskata Dūržava prez srednite vekove*, II, pt. 2 (Sofia, 1927), 145-52. Cf. G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, 1957), 208-9.

and distinguished Slavic missionaries to his court in Pliska, for these men would make him less dependent upon the Byzantine clergy. Whether he had ever met Methodius, as has so often been suggested, really does not matter.<sup>8</sup> Boris had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the Cyrillo-Methodian ideology, which proclaimed the sacred principle of equality of all nations and languages and the right of each nation to share equally in spiritual benefits.<sup>9</sup> Since this view implied sovereignty over one's own nation, language, and Church, nothing could have been better suited to his aspirations. Moreover, Slavic Christianity would produce a much desired internal harmony in the Bulgarian realm by completing the Slavicization of the Turkic Bulgar element, which had originally founded the state, but which was now in decline and often prone to oppose Boris' policies bitterly.<sup>10</sup>

Boris, however, did not keep Clement and his followers in the capital for long, but settled some, including Nahum, near Preslav, at the Monastery of Saint Panteleimon, which was destined to become an important center of Slavic culture. The remaining Slavic missionaries, under the leadership of Clement, were sent to evangelize the outlying Macedonian provinces. Boris must have had several reasons for doing this. Had he introduced the Slavic liturgy into the capital and established a large educational center there, his action would have provoked immediate opposition among the Byzantine clergy and the followers of the "heresy" of the three tongues, which claimed that only Greek, Latin, and Hebrew were suitable for divine worship.<sup>11</sup> Such an action would also have caused dissension among the Bulgar boyars at the court, who remained hostile to Slavic Christianity, as the events of 893 that led to the fall of Vladimir, son and successor of Boris, clearly illustrate.<sup>12</sup>

The exact location of the district known as Kutmichevitsa, which was selected for Clement's missionary work, still remains the subject of great controversy.<sup>13</sup> It is certain, however, that it was a territory of considerable size, and that it included the regions of Ohrid, Glavinitsa, and Devol, because it was in these three regions that Boris granted Clement places of residence for his Slavic school and houses for rest and meditation.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Such a meeting has been suggested by V. Zlatarski, among others. See Zlatarski, *op. cit.*, 219ff., and "Vel'ká Morava a Bulharsko v IX storoci," *Riša Vel'komoravská* (Prague, 1933), 285. Cf. I. Dujcev, "Vrúzki meždu čehi, slovaci i bulgari prez srednovekovieto," *Čechoslovakija i Búlgarija prez vekovete* (Sofia, 1963), 28. Well-founded doubts concerning such a meeting have been expressed by Dvornik, *op. cit.*, 279.

<sup>9</sup> R. Jakobson, "The Beginnings of National Self-Determination in Europe," *Review of Politics*, 7 (1945), 33-9, and *idem*, "The Kernel," 52-5.

<sup>10</sup> Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 43ff. Cf. S. Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London, 1930), 105-6; M. Spinka, *A History of Christianity in the Balkans* (Chicago, 1933), 47-50.

<sup>11</sup> I. Dujčev, "Il problema delle lingue nazionali nel Medio Evo e gli Slavi," *Ricerche slavistiche*, 8 (1960), 39-60. Cf. I. Ševčenko, "Three Paradoxes of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission," *Slavic Review*, 23 (1964), 226ff.

<sup>12</sup> Zlatarski, *op. cit.*, 250ff.; Runciman, *op. cit.*, 134.

<sup>13</sup> For a survey of the various theories, see Dvornik, *op. cit.*, 315, note 1. Cf. Zlatarski, *op. cit.*, 226ff.; F. Grivec, *Konstantin und Method, Lehrer der Slaven* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 156; Gautier, *loc. cit.*, 200-1.

<sup>14</sup> *Vita Clementis*, XVII (Migne, 1224). Glavinitsa is located by K. Mijatev ("Gde se e namirala Glavinica," *Archeologija*, 4, fasc. 1 [1962], 5-6), supporting Dj. Stričević's thesis, near the present-day village of Zglavenica north of Ohrid, while by I. Snegarov ("Küde se namiral srednovekovnjat grad Glavinica-Glavenica," *ibid.*, 5, fasc. 3 [1963], 1-5) it is located in Southern Albania.

In his new mission, Clement faithfully followed the example of his teachers in Moravia. He first labored to create a great educational center, which would eventually provide trained priests and other clerics needed for a Slavic Bulgarian Church. During his seven-year activity as an apostolic teacher in Kutmichevitsa, Clement produced a large number of disciples—3500 we are told—who, ordained as readers, subdeacons, deacons, and priests, were sent to their posts to spread the Slavic Word.<sup>15</sup> In this manner, the work of Cyril and Methodius was transplanted from Moravia to the fertile soil of Macedonia, which became the cradle of Slavic Christianity in the Balkans.<sup>16</sup>

The teaching activity of Clement is described by one of his disciples in glowing terms. He had never seen him idle, the disciple reports, but always engaged day and night either in teaching the alphabet or the art of writing, or in explaining the meaning of the Scriptures.<sup>17</sup> He was a true continuator of the Cyrillic-Methodian tradition with its emphasis on the interpretation of the Divine Word. What remained of his time he devoted to praying, reading, or writing. Clement's work in Kutmichevitsa met with singular success. Just as his teacher Methodius had been elevated to the episcopal dignity after a fruitful missionary career, so Clement was made bishop when Symeon, the younger son of Boris, became the new Bulgarian ruler in 893.

The reign of Symeon, the most glorious period of Bulgarian history, was of paramount importance for the future of the Slavic liturgy and letters in Bulgaria. Symeon had spent much of his youth in Constantinople, living, it seems, in the precincts of the palace, and probably studying not only at Photius' Slavic school but also at the University. There is every reason to assume that while in the imperial city he met the Slavic clergy left there by Methodius in 882,<sup>18</sup> as well as the Slavic missionaries from Moravia, whom the Emperor's ambassadors had rescued from slavery in Venice four years later.<sup>19</sup> Upon his return to Bulgaria, Symeon furthered his associations with the Cyrillic-Methodian tradition at the royal Monastery of Saint Panteleimon, where he remained until his father called him to the throne to replace his older brother, the victim

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, XVIII (Migne, 1225). Under Boris Slavic Christianity had also spread in the region of Bregalnitsa in Macedonia. See Theophylactus, archbishop of Ohrid, *Historia martyrii XV martyrum*, in Migne, PG, CXXVI, 201-8. Cf. Zlatarski, *op. cit.*, 236-9.

<sup>16</sup> V. Jagić, "Izgnanici iz Moravske posle smrti Metodijeve; Širenje slovenske crkve i knjige medju Juž. Slovenima," *Brastvo*, 17 (1923), 19-37. The theories by E. Georgiev that Cyril and Methodius did missionary work among the Bulgarians before they went to Moravia and that the Moravian tradition and literature had penetrated Bulgaria before 885 are based on mere suppositions. See E. Georgiev, "Prenasanjeto na kirilometodievata knižovna tradicija ot Veliko Moravija v Bălgarija," *Sbornik v čest na akad. A. Teodorov-Balan* (Sofia, 1955), 203-12; *idem*, *Razcvetut*, 29-68; *idem*, "Kiril i Metodij i razvitieto na bălgarskata kultura," *Chilijsada i sto godini na slavjanska pismenost*, 863-1963; *Sbornik v čest na Kiril i Metodij* (Sofia, 1963), 21-49.

<sup>17</sup> *Vita Clementis*, XVIII (Migne, 1225). This part of the Life, which is in the form of an eye-witness' account, must definitely belong to the original Slavic version written by one of Clement's disciples. For a Panegyric of Saint Clement in verse, also written by one of his disciples, see Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 322-7. Cf. Dj. Sp. Radojičić, *Razvojni luk stare srpske književnosti* (Novi Sad, 1962), 53-61.

<sup>18</sup> *Vita Methodii*, XIII (F. Grivec and F. Tomšić, eds., "Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses Fontes," *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta*, 4 [1960], 163). Cf. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, 271 ff.; *idem*, *Les Légendes de Constantin et Methode vue de Byzance* (Prague, 1933), 276.

<sup>19</sup> *Vita Nahum*, in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 306.

of an attempted return to paganism. The royal power was entrusted to Symeon in 893 at a national assembly, which effected fundamental reforms for which Boris had striven throughout his reign.<sup>20</sup> First of all, Slavic was approved as the official language of the State and the Church. Furthermore, Preslav, the center of Slavic missionary and literary work, became not only the new Bulgarian capital, but also the seat of the archbishop.

The acceptance of the new official language was followed by the introduction of a new script, the so-called Cyrillic alphabet, which came to replace the Glagolitic and served as the prototype of the modern Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian alphabets. In this context, as Il'inskij has so convincingly demonstrated, the phrase *пътложено книгъ* in the Bulgarian version of the Short Chronicle by Patriarch Nicephorus should be understood to mean simply transliteration from one Slavic alphabet to the other.<sup>21</sup>

It is not my intention here to enter into the endless discussion concerning the origin and character of the Slavic alphabets. I shall limit myself to a few remarks only, which are pertinent to the specific subject of my paper. Of the two existing Slavic alphabets, the Glagolitic and the Cyrillic, the former is an original creation apparently based on signs of Byzantine tachygraphy, cryptography, and alchemy,<sup>22</sup> while the latter is a mere adaptation of the Greek uncial script of the ninth century, with a few additions to render sounds unknown to the Greek alphabet. That the two alphabets are closely interrelated cannot be doubted even by the most casual observer. They are not only phonetically identical, but also share, either in a completely unchanged or in an adapted form, most of the letters which represent Slavic phonetic peculiarities.<sup>23</sup>

Though in recent years new and daring theories have been advanced about the original Slavic alphabet, in particular by Professor Georgiev,<sup>24</sup> the philological observations of earlier scholars as to the prior origin of the Glagolitic

<sup>20</sup> Zlatarski, *op. cit.*, 254 ff.

<sup>21</sup> G. A. Il'inskij, "Gde, kogda, kem i s kakoju celju Glagolica byla zamenena 'Kirilice'?", *Byzantinoslavica*, 3 (1931), 79–88. For the transition from the Glagolitic alphabet to the Cyrillic, see also F. Grivec, "Vprašanija o Konstantinu in Metodu," *Slovo*, 11–12 (1962), 131–47.

<sup>22</sup> E. E. Granstrem, "O proischoždenii glagoličeskoj azbuki," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 11 (1955), 300–13. For a survey of other unconvincing theories concerning the origin of the Glagolitic script, see F. Zagiba, "Neue Probleme in der kyrillo-methodianischen Forschung," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 11 (1962), 110–12; see also T. Eckhardt, "Theorien über den Ursprung der Glagolica," *Slovo*, 13 (1963), 87–118.

<sup>23</sup> N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik; Schrift-, Laut- und Formensystem* (Vienna, 1954), 15 ff. Cf. A. Vaillant, "L'alphabet vieux-slave," *Revue des études slaves*, 32 (1955), 7–8; A. Dostál, "Die Widerspiegelung der byzantinischen Welt in der ältesten Periode der slavischen Sprachen, besonders im Altkirchenslawischen," *Aus der byzantinischen Arbeit der Tschechoslowakischen Republik* (Berlin, 1957), 43.

<sup>24</sup> The theory by E. Georgiev that the so-called Cyrillic alphabet had a gradual development in pagan Bulgaria before the invention of the Glagolitic by Cyril has been expressed in a number of publications, the most recent being his *Razvjeti na būgarskata literatura v IX–X v.* (Sofia, 1962). For a survey of Georgiev's papers on the subject, see I. Dujčev, A. Kirmagovo, and A. Paunova, "Būgarska kirilometodievska bibliografija za perioda 1944–62," *Chiljada i sto godini*, 526–9. For a convincing refutation of Georgiev's theory, see K. Horálek, "Načaloto na pismenostta u Slavjanite," *Sbornik u čest na akad. A. Teodorov-Balan* (Sofia, 1955), 417–24; *idem*, "K počátku knižní uzdělanosti u Slovanů," *Slavia*, 24 (1955), 169–78; *idem*, "Zum Verhältnis der Kyrillica und Glagolica," *Die Welt der Slaven*, 3 (1958), 232–5. Cf. Zagiba, *loc. cit.*, 110–12.

remain unshaken.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, on the basis of the available data, the view that the Slavs possessed an alphabet of their own before Christianization seems equally unfounded. It is true that at times the Slavs used special signs of their own (that is, what Khrabré called чѣтѣ and ѹѣзы),<sup>26</sup> but these Slavic runes did not have the character of a coherent alphabet. The only alphabets which the Slavs used before Christianization were, again according to Khrabré, Greek and Latin, бѣзъ ѹѣстроенія, without any adaptation. The numerous so-called proto-Bulgar inscriptions, written in Greek or using the Greek script, clearly illustrate what Khrabré had in mind when he wrote his treatise on the Slavic alphabet toward the end of the ninth or the very beginning of the tenth century.<sup>27</sup>

Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the alphabet which Cyril and Methodius created and brought to the Slavs with Christianity was a unique conception attributed to divine inspiration, as was stressed in contemporary sources, and quite different from the Greek.<sup>28</sup> One could hardly attach such originality to the alphabet which we call Cyrillic today. It is sufficient only to recall that the origin of the Cyrillic was so obvious to the editors of the pre-Revolutionary Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology that they simply asked the palaeographer Gardthausen to supply them with a chapter on the Greek script of the ninth and tenth centuries.<sup>29</sup> Only the Glagolitic alphabet then, with its elaborate and unique form, could correspond to the description given in contemporary evidence.

What specific factors necessitated the introduction of the new alphabet, which in the course of time was to eclipse the Glagolitic, still remains a puzzling problem. Was it merely the result of special Bulgarian cultural conditions at the close of the ninth century, which arose primarily from the proximity of Constantinople, the Greek origin of Bulgarian Christianity, and the long acquaintance of that once classical territory with the Greek alphabet? Or was it rather a compromise between the Slavic party, on the one hand, and the Byzantine clergy and their followers in Bulgaria on the other?<sup>30</sup> For certainly,

<sup>25</sup> V. Jagić, "Grafika u Slavjan; Glagoličesko pismo," *Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii*, III, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1911), 51ff.; R. Nahtigal, "Doneski k vprašanju o postanku glagolice," *Razprave Znam. društva za humanistične vede*, 1 (1924), 135ff.; J. Vajs, *Rukovět hlaholské paleografie* (Prague, 1932), 1ff. Dostál, *loc. cit.*, 43. Cf. V. Jagić, *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1913), 194ff.; Grivec, *op. cit.*, 172ff.

<sup>26</sup> Khrabré, in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 442.

<sup>27</sup> V. Beševliev, *Půrvobulgarski nadpisi; Uvod, tekst i komentar* (Sofia, 1934); *idem*, *Půrvobulgarski nadpisi; Dobavki i opravki* (Sofia, 1936); V. Beševliev and H. Grégoire, "Les inscriptions protobulgares," *Byzantion*, 25-7 (1955-7), 853-80, 28 (1958), 255-323; 29-30 (1959-60), 477-500 (to be continued); V. Beševliev, *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1963); cf. *idem*, "Die protobulgarischen Inschriften," *Das Altertum*, 6 (1960), 168-76. For the extensive literature on the subject, see Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, 303-8. For two inscriptions in the Greek alphabet, but in the proto-Bulgar language, see I. Venedikov, "Trois inscriptions protobulgares," *Razkopki i proučevanja* (Sofia, 1950), 167-87.

<sup>28</sup> *Vita Constantini*, XIV (Grivec and Tomšić, 129) and *Vita Methodii*, V (*ibid.*, 155), where it is explicitly stated that Cyril had invented the Slavic alphabet by divine inspiration. The novelty of the Slavic alphabet is also stressed in the Panegyric oration (*Slovo pochvalno*) in honor of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, composed shortly after the latter's death in 885 (Grivec, *op. cit.*, 173, 212, 251-2), and in *Vita Clementis*, II (Migne, 1196).

<sup>29</sup> V. Gardthausen, "Grečeskoe pis'mo IX-X stoletij," *Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii*, III, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1911), 37-50. Cf. I. Ševčenko, "Byzantine Cultural Influences," *Rewriting Russian History*, ed. by C. E. Black (New York, 1962), 174.

<sup>30</sup> B. Koneski, "Ohridska književna škola," *Slovo*, 6-8 (1957), 188.

even after the reforms of 893 the Byzantine party continued to exercise influence, and the "heresy" of the three tongues remained strong enough to prompt Khrabř's fierce attack, which strikingly echoes the very arguments Cyril had once used in his debate with the Latin clergy in Venice.<sup>31</sup>

The two alphabets lived for a long time side by side in Bulgaria, and this symbiosis is reflected in its two great cultural centers, Preslav and Ohrid. But the prevailing use of the one or the other eventually determined, to a large extent, the distinctive character of each of these two centers. Eastern Bulgaria, with the capital city of Preslav, became the home of the Cyrillic alphabet, while Macedonia, with its center at Ohrid, continued to adhere to the alphabet invented by Cyril and introduced there by Clement and his group.

The new Bulgarian ruler, Symeon, recognized the successful missionary work of Clement by investing him with the bishopric of Devritsa (Dremvitsa) and Velitsa. This dual episcopal see seems to have been created especially for Clement and was probably located in central Macedonia, between the rivers Vardar and Bregalnitsa.<sup>32</sup> His place, meanwhile, as the head of the Slavic school in Kutmichevitsa was taken by his co-disciple Nahum.<sup>33</sup> In his new post, as the first Bulgarian bishop to celebrate the liturgy in Slavic, Clement continued his missionary and educational work with the same fervor and zeal as before. The hagiographer informs us that Clement always took the great Methodius as his ideal, and that his life was patterned with care after the teacher whom he had known so well since early youth. Clement's activity among the Bulgarians is likened by the same source to that of Saint Paul among the Corinthians. And we should recall that Saint Paul had emerged as the mainstay of the Moravian doctrine of the equality of the languages.<sup>34</sup>

Since Clement had noticed that many of the Bulgarian clergy were poorly acquainted with the Greek language and possessed no Slavic sermons, he undertook to prepare in clear and simple language a series of homilies for all the Church festivals. He also produced panegyrics, in a more ornate style, in honor of the Holy Virgin, John the Baptist, the Prophets and Apostles, and several martyrs and Church Fathers. Furthermore, Clement composed many hymns and prayers, and shortly before his death in 916, at his monastery by

<sup>31</sup> *Vita Constatini*, XVI (Grivec and Tomšić, 134). Cf. D. Angelov, "Kiril i Metodij i vizantijskata kultura i politika," *Chiljada i sto godini*, 67 ff.; I. Snegarev, "Černorizec Chrabř," *ibid.*, 305 ff.

<sup>32</sup> I. Snegarov, "De la question du diocèse de Clement d'Ochride," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochride 1961, Résumés des communications* (Belgrade-Ohrid, 1961), 94-5; *idem*, "Po výroso za eparchijata na Kliment Ochridski," *Izvestija na Instituta za istorija*, 10 (1962), 205-23. For the hypothesis that Velikaja in Moravia is meant here by Velitsa and that Clement might have been a bishop of the Moravian Velikaja, see R. Jakobson, "Velikaja Moravija ili Velikaja nad Moravoj?", *Ezikovedsko-etnografski izsledvanija v pamet na akad. Stojan Romanski* (Sofia, 1960), 485-6. Since my paper was sent to the printer, P. Gautier's article, "Clement d'Ohrid, évêque de Dragvista," (*Revue des études byzantines*, 22 [1964], 199-214), has appeared, in which the author, on the basis of a reference to Clement as ἐπίσκοπος Δραγβίστας in a thirteenth-century manuscript (*Cod. Vat. gr. 1409*, fol. 352<sup>r</sup>), maintains that the correct form for the name of Clement's see is Dragvista, after a homonymous region located in southern Macedonia, in the area south of Ohrid and between Thessalonica and the Adriatic Sea.

<sup>33</sup> *Vita Nahum*, in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 306.

<sup>34</sup> Jakobson, "The Beginnings," 33; *idem*, "Minor Native Sources for the Early History of the Slavic Church," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, 2 (1954), 44; *idem*, "St. Constantine's Prologue to the Gospel," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, 7 (1963), 15.

Lake Ohrid, he completed the translation of the Triodion, containing the hymns for the offices from Easter to Pentecost.<sup>35</sup>

To determine exactly the literary activity of Clement is almost an impossible task. He has enjoyed such great popularity through the ages, and his cult has spread so widely in Macedonia and in the entire Orthodox world that a great number of homilies and panegyrics have been ascribed to him even without evidence to prove his authorship.<sup>36</sup> It is, however, safe to argue on the basis of striking similarities between the Second Freising Fragment and Clement's homily "On the Memory of an Apostle or a Martyr" that he had begun his literary activity before his arrival in Bulgaria.<sup>37</sup> There is also good reason to believe that, while in Moravia and Pannonia, he may have participated in the composition of the Lives of Saint Cyril and Saint Methodius, especially of the latter.<sup>38</sup>

As a missionary and literary figure in the Slavic vernacular, Clement was surpassed only by his masters, Cyril and Methodius. He has been the most prominent and the most direct continuator of their tradition in Bulgaria, where he became not only the spiritual father of the national Church, but also the founder of literature and of culture in general. His legacy became the cornerstone of the so-called School of Ohrid, that great spiritual and cultural center in Macedonia, which radiated a significant influence on Mount Athos, the Balkans, and far away Russia.<sup>39</sup>

Closely associated with Ohrid at the same time was Clement's friend and co-disciple, Nahum. The short Life of Saint Nahum, which we possess in a tenth-century version, is in the pure tradition of Slavic hagiography begun by the Lives of the Slavic apostles.<sup>40</sup> This source, however, fails to provide us with sufficient information about his life and work. As far as we know, Nahum has left no writings. Yet, we learn from contemporary evidence that while he was at the Monastery of Saint Panteleimon, near Preslav, he encouraged the younger scholars to create and develop a Slavic literature.<sup>41</sup> Later, in Macedonia, he humbly and quietly continued the vast educational activities of Clement, and thus carried on the living tradition of Cyril and Methodius until his death in 910, in the monastery he had founded on the southern shore of Lake Ohrid.

<sup>35</sup> *Vita Clementis*, XXII–XXVII (Migne, 1228–36).

<sup>36</sup> Jagić, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 118. Even the creation of the Cyrillic alphabet is sometimes attributed to Clement (Dujčev, "Vržki medždu čehi," 36). Cf. the well-founded critical remarks on this theory by Jagić, *op. cit.*, 120–1.

<sup>37</sup> V. Jagić, "Hat Bischof Klemens für eine seiner Homilien den Text der Freisinger Denkmals vor Augen gehabt?", *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 27 (1905), 395–412; V. Vondrák, "Zur Frage nach dem Verhältnisse des Freisinger Denkmale zu einer Homelie von Klemens," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 28 (1906), 256–60. Cf. Grivec, *op. cit.*, 160–1.

<sup>38</sup> Georgiev, *Razcvet*, 124–31.

<sup>39</sup> P. Dinekov, "Knižovni središča v srednevekova Bǔlgarija," *Istoričeski pregled*, 3 (1946–7), 403–6; Koneski, *loc. cit.*, 177–94; *idem*, "Kulturnata uloga na Ohrid," *Nar. Muzej vo Ohrid, Zbornik na trudovi, Posebno izdanie* (Ohrid, 1961), 3–5.

<sup>40</sup> *Vita Nahum* in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 305–11. Cf. M. Kusseff, "St. Nahum," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 29 (1950–51), 139–52; Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 156–60, 334–9.

<sup>41</sup> See the preface to the *Učitel'noe Evangelie* by Constantine the Presbyter, conveniently reproduced in I. Dujčev, *Iz starata bǔgarska knižnina*, I (Sofia, 1943), 76.

Thanks to Clement and Nahum, the Ohrid school emerged as the most direct heir of the Moravian tradition, and this relationship is clearly illustrated in the basic features of its literature. The Glagolitic alphabet was used continuously in Ohrid and in Macedonia in general until the end of the twelfth century, or perhaps even into the thirteenth century, as has been suggested on the basis of the Bitolje Triodion.<sup>42</sup> Only at that time was it entirely replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet. The Cyrillic was used in Macedonia, it seems, only sporadically until Tsar Samuel established his headquarters in Ohrid in the latter part of the tenth century and subsequently brought there the seat of the Bulgarian patriarch. At that time the use of the Cyrillic expanded rapidly, and eventually prevailed completely. Concrete proof of this development is to be found in such epigraphical evidence as the inscription of Tsar Samuel (993), the inscription from Varoši (996), and the inscription recently discovered in Bitolje.<sup>43</sup>

The adherence of the Ohrid school to the Glagolitic script was the chief factor in the preservation of a strong Moravian and Pannonian influence in Ohrid literary production, which, both in language and in spirit, is closest to the classical form of the Old Church Slavic of Cyril and Methodius. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the oldest and most important monuments of Slavic writing, namely, tenth- and eleventh-century Glagolitic codices such as the Zographensis, the Marianus, the Assemanianus, and the Sinai Psalter and Euchologium, are all of Macedonian origin.<sup>44</sup> The place of their discovery reveals to us the extent of the radiation of the cultural influence of the Ohrid school. Mount Athos, which from an early period seems to have harbored Slavic monks, became an outpost of the Ohrid literary tradition, and from this literary repository of the Christian East, Slavic monks carried the tradition as far as Jerusalem and Mount Sinai.<sup>45</sup>

In the opposite direction, the influence of Ohrid penetrated into Serbia, where it remained predominant, and even reached Bosnia and Croatia.<sup>46</sup> Contacts with the Ohrid school existed in Eastern Bulgaria too. Clement and Nahum both came to Macedonia from this region. Since Ohrid and Preslav were both children of the same spiritual family, there seems no reason to doubt their mutual literary ties. Unlike Ohrid, however, the Preslav school adopted

<sup>42</sup> Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 452-67; J. Hamm, "Glagolica," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, III (Zagreb, 1958), 466.

<sup>43</sup> For the Samuel inscription and the one from Varoši, see Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 24, 27. For the Bitolje inscription, see V. Mošin, "O periodizaciji russko-južnoslavjanskih literaturnykh svjazej X-XV vv.," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 19 (1963), 58. Cf. Dj. Sp. Radojičić, "Ćirilica," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, II (Zagreb, 1956), 627.

<sup>44</sup> W. K. Matthews, "Sources of Old Slavonic," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 28 (1949-50), 477 ff.

<sup>45</sup> G. A. Il'inskij, "Značenie Afona v istorii slavjanskoj pis'mennosti," *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveščenija*, N.S., 18 (1908), 1-41; V. Rozov, "Bolgarskie rukopisi Ierusalima i Sinaia," *Minalo*, 3, no. 9 (1914), 16-36; *idem*, "Srpski rukopisi Ierusalima i Sinaia," *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 5 (1925-6), 118-29; *idem*, "Serby v Palestine i na Sinaje," *Trudy IV-go s"jezda russkich organizacij za granicę* (Belgrade, 1929), 195-200; M. N. Speranskij, "Slavjanskaja pis'mennost' XI-XIV vv. na Sinae i v Palestine," *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti*, 32 (1927), 43-118; N. N. Rozov, "Južnoslavjanskie rukopisi Sinajskog monastyrja," *Filologičeskie nauki, Naučnye doklady vyšszej školy*, 2 (1961), 129-38; K. W. Clark, "Research Resources in St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai," *Trudy XXV međunarodnog kongressa vostokovedov, Moskva 9-16 avgusta 1960*, I (Moscow, 1962), 517-22.

<sup>46</sup> Koneski, *loc. cit.*, 193.

the Cyrillic script, an act which strengthened the growing differences between the two schools, and eventually became very important for the subsequent development of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition.

This tradition was exposed to two particular influences in Eastern Bulgaria. The first was the primitive proto-Bulgar literature, part of which has survived in the proto-Bulgar inscriptions.<sup>47</sup> Recent theories notwithstanding, however, the importance of this influence was rather negligible. Its traces can be discerned clearly only in the List of the Bulgar princes, preserved in the Russian *Ellinskij Letopisec*.<sup>48</sup> It is thus a fallacy to credit this proto-Bulgar literature with an influence on Slavic writing in Bulgaria equivalent to the role played by Latin in the formation and the development of the Czech and Polish vernacular literatures.<sup>49</sup>

On the other hand, the second influence, the direct Byzantine impact, was of paramount importance in the development of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in Eastern Bulgaria. It is true that the Slavic liturgy and letters which Cyril and Methodius brought to the Great Moravian Empire were of Byzantine origin and inspiration, but in time the strong Latin influences present in Moravia forced important adoptions and adaptations, thus creating a composite tradition of Byzantine and Latin elements, a true bridge between East and West. In Preslav, none of these special conditions existed, and the Byzantine influence, strengthened by the proximity of Constantinople and by the Byzantine tutelage of the Bulgarian Church, reigned supreme.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Slavic liturgy quickly and completely adapted itself in Bulgaria to the Byzantine rite,<sup>50</sup> just as it is natural to expect that the literary output of Eastern Bulgaria would bear traces of this strong Byzantine influence. Unlike that of Ohrid, the language of this literature displays a marked deviation from Moravisms and Pannonisms, which were here gradually replaced by new lexical elements directly borrowed or translated from the Greek.<sup>51</sup>

In spite of the early predominance of the Cyrillic alphabet in Eastern Bulgaria, we notice here, as in Macedonia, a symbiosis of the two scripts. A number of Glagolitic inscriptions have been found in Symeon's Round Church at Preslav and on tablets recently discovered in Patlejna.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, the

<sup>47</sup> See *supra*, note 27.

<sup>48</sup> See the most recent edition of this text, accompanied by extensive bibliography, in Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, II (Berlin, 1958), 352-4. Cf. V. Beševliev's remarks in *Izvest. na Archeol. inst.*, 24 (1961), 1-8.

<sup>49</sup> The Bulgarian scholars P. Dinekov and V. Beševliev attribute a significant role to the proto-Bulgar literature in this respect. See P. Dinekov, "Über die Anfänge der bulgarischen Literatur," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, 3 (1960), 109-21, and V. Beševliev, "Die Anfänge der bulgarischen Literatur," *ibid.*, 4 (1961), 116-45. Cf. the critical remarks on the Bulgarian thesis by N. Gudzij, "Literatura Kievskoj Rusi i drevnejšie inoslavjanski literatury," *Issledovanija po slavjanskemu literaturovedeniju i fol'kloristike* (Moscow, 1960), 59-60.

<sup>50</sup> I. Gošev, "Starobulgarskata liturgija spored būgarski i vizantijski izvori ot IX-XI vv.," *Godišnik na Sof. Universitet, Bog. Fak.*, 9 (1932), 79 pp.

<sup>51</sup> Jagib, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 267; Koneski, *loc. cit.*, 194.

<sup>52</sup> K. Mijatev, "Epigrafičeskie materialy iz Preslava," *Byzantinoslavica*, 3 (1931), 383-403; *idem*, *Krūglata cūrvka v Preslav* (Sofia, 1932); V. Ivanova, "Sledite ot Glagolica v istočna Būgarija," *Byzantinoslavica*, 4 (1932), 227-33; S. Stančev, "Pliska und Preslav: Ihre archäologischen Denkmäler und deren Erforschung," *Antike und Mittelalter in Bulgarien* (Berlin, 1960), 260; I. Gošev, *Starobulgarski galgolitesci i kirički nadpisi ot IX i X v.* (Sofia, 1961).

use of Glagolitic can also be traced, to a certain degree, in a number of literary works of purely Eastern Bulgarian origin, for example, the *Hexaemeron* by John the Exarch.<sup>53</sup> But we can surmise from epigraphical evidence in the Round Church at Preslav and from the Mostič inscription that in the course of the tenth century the Cyrillic script must have eclipsed the Glagolitic in Eastern Bulgaria.<sup>54</sup> The Dobrudja inscription of 943, if we consider it to be authentic, also supports this conclusion, and provides us not only with the earliest dated monument of Slavic writing, but also with the evidence that, in the first half of the tenth century, the Cyrillic alphabet had spread as far north as the Danubian Delta.<sup>55</sup> The early extinction of the use of the Glagolitic alphabet in Eastern Bulgaria explains quite convincingly the absence of Glagolism in Russia, save for a very few disputed traces in Russian manuscripts and for the Novgorod graffiti from the eleventh century.<sup>56</sup>

Under Symeon's protection the Preslav center grew and flourished rapidly, and soon overshadowed the Ohrid school. Symeon's desire to rival the Byzantine Emperor politically is evident from his efforts to obtain the imperial crown, and thereby to claim the leading position in the Byzantine hierarchy of states. But it is equally clear that he definitely had ambitions to foster a great literature in his realm. Thus, on the basis of the Cyrillo-Methodian heritage, brought to Bulgaria by Clement and his associates, a rich literature developed in Preslav, the effects of which were soon to be widely and permanently felt.<sup>57</sup>

Symeon, himself, one of the best educated men of his age, organized and

<sup>53</sup> H. Jaksche, "Glagolitische Spuren im Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes," *Die Welt der Slaven*, 4 (1959), 258-301.

<sup>54</sup> Mijatev, *op. cit.*, 153 ff.; S. Stančev, "Nadpisū na čürgubilja Mostič ot Preslav," in *Nadpisū na čürgubilja Mostič* (Sofia, 1955), 3 ff.; *idem*, "Pliska und Preslav," 249, 259-60; St. Michailova, "Archeologičeski materiali ot Pliska, 1948-51 g.," *Izvestija na Archeologičeskija institut*, 20 (1955), 49-181; V. Beševliev, "Novi otkusleci ot pürvobülgarski i drugi srednovekovni nadpisi ot Pliska i Preslav," *ibid.*, 282-3; Gošev, *op. cit.*, 1 ff.; *idem*, "Razvitie na negrúckite kirilometodievske bukveni znaci v t. nar. Kirilica," *Chiljada i sto godini*, 275-86.

<sup>55</sup> D. Bogdan, "Dobrudžanskaja nadpis' 943 g.," *Romanoslavica*, 1 (1958), 88-104; M. N. Tichomirov, "Načalo slavjanskoj pis'mennosti v svete novejšich otkrytiij," *Voprosy istorii* (1959), no. 4, 98-105. Cf. the observations by F. V. Mareš, "Dva objevy starých slovanských nápisů (v SSSR u Smolenska a v Rumunsku)," *Slavia*, 20 (1951), 497-514. Professor R. Jakobson has expressed doubts about the authenticity of this inscription in his article "Vestiges of the Earliest Russian Vernacular," *Word*, 8 (1952), 350-2. The inscription is considered spurious by G. Nandriš, "A Spurious Slavonic Inscription from the Danube Canal," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 38 (1959-60), 530-4. For other early Slavic graffiti and inscriptions discovered in Dobrudja, see D. Bogdan, "Grafitele de la Basarabi," *Analele Universității C. I. Parhon, Seria științe sociale, Istorie*, 9 (1960), 31-49.

<sup>56</sup> M. Murko, *Geschichte der älteren südslavischen Literaturen* (Leipzig, 1908), 60; J. Vajs, "Hlaholice na Rusi - Novgorodské sgrafity," *Byzantinoslavica*, 7 (1937-8), 184-8; Mošin, *loc. cit.*, 55; cf. Jagić, *op. cit.*, 125-6.

<sup>57</sup> For a general survey of the Golden Age of mediaeval Bulgarian literature, see Murko, *op. cit.*, 57 ff.; M. Weingart, *Bulhaři a Čárihrad před tisíciletím; List z dějin byzantských vlivů na osvětu slovanskou* (Prague, 1915); F. Trograncič, *Letteratura medioevale degli Slavi meridionali* (Rome, 1950), 83 ff.; R. Bernard, "Tableau de la littérature vieux-slave et de la littérature ancienne de la Bulgarie," *Histoire générale des littératures*, I (Paris, 1961), 407 ff. The most recent Bulgarian works on the subject are Georgiev, *Razcvetut*, and the *Istorija na bülgarshata literatura*, I (Sofia, 1962), 77 ff., where all the important earlier Bulgarian contributions are mentioned. For a recent discussion of the Byzantine impact on mediaeval Bulgarian literature, see I. P. Eremin, "O vizantijskom vlijanii v bolgarskoj i drevnerusskoj literaturach IX-XII vv.," *Slavjanskie literatury; Doklady sovetskoy delegacii V međun. s'ezd slavistov* (Moscow, 1963), 5-13.

sponsored a lively activity in translations and compilations.<sup>58</sup> The "Orthodox Tsar," as he was called, admired above all the other Fathers of the Church, John Chrysostom, who subsequently became a great favorite in mediaeval Slavic literature. Symeon prepared, either alone or with the help of an assistant, an anthology of excerpts from John Chrysostom's writings, to which he characteristically gave the name *Zlatostruj*, the Goldstream.<sup>59</sup> The Tsar further supervised a collection of explanatory extracts from the Church Fathers, as well as other Byzantine writings, including Choeroboscus' treatise on the tropes and figures of speech. The *Izbornik* of 1073, as this collection is known to us from a Russian copy prepared for the Kievan prince Sviatoslav, contains a preface with a flattering tribute to the patronage of Symeon, "the new Ptolemy, who, like the industrious bee, gathers the juice of all the flowers."<sup>60</sup>

But Constantine the Presbyter and John the Exarch were the pride and the glory of the Preslav school. Constantine had been a disciple of Methodius and evidently composed the office for him.<sup>61</sup> In his Didactic Gospel (*Učitel'noe Evangelie*) he translated several homilies, or sections thereof, by John Chrysostom and other Fathers of the Church, to which he added some parts of his own.<sup>62</sup> Later, in 907, at the request of Symeon himself, Constantine, as bishop of Preslav, translated the sermons of Athanasius the Great against the Arians.<sup>63</sup> He seems also to have been responsible for the Slavic version of the Short Chronicle of Patriarch Nicephorus, which he extended to the year 894.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Georgiev, *op.cit.*, 271-98; I. Dujčev, "Prevodna knižnina," *Istorija na bulgarskata literatura*, I, 158-63.

<sup>59</sup> V. M. Malinin, *Zlatostruj, Desyat' slov Zlatostruja XII* (St. Petersburg, 1910); G. A. Il'inskij, *Zlatostruj A. F. Byčkova XI v.* (Sofia, 1929). Cf. A. I. Sobolevskij, "Ioann Zlatoust v russkoj pis'mennosti," *Bogoslovskaja enciklopedija*, VI (St. Petersburg, 1905), 941 ff.

<sup>60</sup> Dujčev, *Iz starata būlg. knižnina*, I, 77, where the preface to the *Izbornik* is conveniently reproduced. For the complete text, see *Izbornik Velikogo Knjazja Sviatoslava Jaroslavica 1073 g.* (St. Petersburg, 1880). Cf. L. Masing, "Studien zur Kenntnis des Izbornik 1073 nebst Bemerkungen zu den jüngeren Handschriften," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 8 (1885), 357-95 (cf. 549-72), 9 (1886), 77-112. A. A. Šachmatov ("Drevnebolgarskaja enciklopedija X v.," *Vizantijskij vremennik*, 7 [1900], 1-35) has suggested, but rather unconvincingly, that under Symeon an extensive encyclopedia of translations was composed in three or four volumes, part of which was the *Izbornik* of 1073. For the Slavic version of the treatise by George Choeroboscus, see J. Besharov, *Imagery of the Igor's Tale in the Light of Byzantino-Slavic Poetic Theory* (Leiden, 1956), 1-50.

<sup>61</sup> J. Pavić, "Staroslavenski pjesnički kanon u čast sv. Metodija i njegov autor," *Bogoslovská smotra*, 24 (1936), 59-86; D. Kostić, "Bulgarski episkop Konstantin—pisac službe sv. Metodiju," *Byzantinoslavica*, 7 (1938), 189-211. On Constantine Presbyter in general, see A. I. Sobolevskij, "Episkop Konstantin," *Sbornik za narodni umovorenija i knižnina*, 18 (1901), 68-73; Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 161-201; *idem*, "Konstantin Preslavski," *Istorija na būgarskata literatura*, I, 112-26, 428-9.

<sup>62</sup> Of the fifty-one homilies included in the *Učitel'noe Evangelie*, nineteen have been published by Archbishop Antonij, *Iz istorii christianskoj propovědi* (St. Petersburg, 1895), 174 ff., ten by A. V. Michajlov, "K voprosu ob Učitel'nom evangeliu Konstantina, episkopa Bolgarskogo," *Trudy Slavjanskoj komissii Imper. Moskovskogo archeologičeskogo obščestva*, I (1895), 111-33, and one by V. Jagić, "Nedjeljna propovjedanja Konstantina Prezvitera Bulgarskoga po starosrpskom rukopisu XIII vjeka," *Starine Jugosl. Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 5 (1873), 28-42, while the rest remain still unpublished. For the date of their composition, see Ju. Trifonov, "Koga sa pisani Učitelnoto evangeliu na episkop Konstantin i Besedata na Kozma Presbiter," *Spisanie na Būgarskata Akademija na naukite*, 58 (1939), 4 ff.

<sup>63</sup> A. Vaillant, *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase; Version slave et traduction en français* (Sofia, 1954); *idem*, "Notes sur l'aspect dans la traduction de saint Athanase de Constantin le Prêtre," *Slavia*, 25 (1956), 234-40.

<sup>64</sup> M. Weingart, *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře cirkevně-slovanské*, I (Bratislava, 1922), 55-62; cf. Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, I, 456-9; V. Zlatarski, "Naj-starijat istoričeski trud v starobulgarskata knižnina," *Spisanie na Būgarskata Akademija na naukite*, 27 (1923), 132-82; A. Vaillant, "Les dates dans la chronologie de Constantin le Prêtre," *Byzantinoslavica*, 9 (1948), 186 ff.

Constantine also distinguished himself as a poet. As a prologue to his Didactic Gospel, an alphabetical prayer (*Azbučnaja molitva*) often appears in the manuscripts. The work was probably written in 893, for it states that thirty years had passed since the Christianization of the Slavs. This prayer was undoubtedly one of the first Slavic attempts at poetry of a non-musical ecclesiastic nature, and it displayed a certain originality in the adaptation of the Byzantine dodecasyllabic verse to a totally new verbal material.<sup>65</sup> Ivan Franko called it "a poem of exquisitely pure and artistic form, of high poetic value, and the product of an intense religious feeling."<sup>66</sup> The poem is entirely conceived in the spirit of the famous Prologue (*Proglas*) attributed to Cyril himself.<sup>67</sup> It glorifies national letters, faithfully echoing the ideology of Cyril and Methodius, whom the poet recalls in order to assure them that their names and their work have been his guiding stars.

The other great luminary of Preslav, John the Exarch, was the first to produce a Slavic translation of John of Damascus, who remained for the Slavs, as for the Byzantines, a source of inspiration for hymnography and the classical exponent of Eastern Orthodoxy.<sup>68</sup> John the Exarch translated the most important parts of the "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith" from the Source of Knowledge, and he wrote a cosmological commentary on Genesis. The latter, known as *Šestodnev*, the Hexaemeron, is an enormous composition, based on an adaptation of the homonymous work of Basil the Great, to which John the Exarch added translations from the writings of other Church Fathers and Byzantine authors.<sup>69</sup> The philosophical and scientific lore found in John's Hexaemeron was a novel element in Slavic literature, but it did not disturb in any way the religious and ecclesiastical outlook of this polyhistor.

John the Exarch compared himself to a poor builder who has brought to an already finished construction merely a few stones and a little wood and straw.<sup>70</sup> And he said that he would have preferred to refuse the task of translating John of Damascus, lest his feeble powers distort the literary tradition begun by Cyril and Methodius in such a masterly fashion, had he not been asked to

<sup>65</sup> See the latest critical edition in R. Nahtigal, "Rekonstrukcija treh starocerkvenoslov. izvirnih pesnitez," *Razprave Slovanske Akademije znanosti in umetnosti*, I (1943), 45–73; cf. A. I. Sobolevskij, "Čerkovno-slavjanskité stichotvorenija v IX–X věk i těchnoto značenie za čerkovno-slavěnskija ezik," *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniya i knižnina*, 16–17 (1900), 314–24; Grivec, *op. cit.*, 215–7.

<sup>66</sup> I. Franko, "Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte der kirchenslavischen Litteratur," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 35 (1914), 151.

<sup>67</sup> R. Jakobson, "The Slavic Response to Byzantine Poetry," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochridé 1961, Rapports* (Belgrade-Ohrid, 1961), 264; *idem*, "St. Constantine's Prologue to the Gospel," 14–19. Cf. A. Vaillant, "Une poésie vieux-slave: La Préface de l'Évangile," *Revue des études slaves*, 33 (1956), 7–25; Grivec, *op. cit.*, 217–21.

<sup>68</sup> *Bogoslovie sv. Ioanna Damaskina v perevode Ioanna Eksarcha Bolgarškogo po charatejnomu spisku Mosk. Sinod. biblioteki* (Moscow, 1878). On the Slavic version of John of Damascus, see A. S. Archangel'skij, *K izucheniju drevne-russkoj literatury: Tворения отцов Церкви в древне-русской пис'mennosti*, I (Kazan', 1888), 98–126; B. Kotter, *Die Überlieferung der Pege Gnoseos des hl. Johannes von Damaskos* (Ettal, 1959), 193, 219, 232. On John the Exarch in general, see Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 202–70; I. Dujčev, "Ioan Eksarch," *Istorija na būlgarskata literatura*, I, 127–40, 429; extensive bibliography in C. Kristanov and I. Dujčev, *Esstvoznanieto v srednovekovna Būlgarija* (Sofia, 1954), 54–6.

<sup>69</sup> See the recent edition by R. Aitzetmüller, *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes*, I–III (Graz, 1958–61). Cf. A. Leskien, "Zum Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 26 (1904), 1–70.

<sup>70</sup> Aitzetmüller, *Das Hexaemeron*, I, 45 ff.

do it by the royal monk Doks (Duks).<sup>71</sup> Despite his modest self-depreciation, however, the contribution of John the Exarch to Slavic letters remains important indeed. Although his art of translation was deficient and mechanical, John, nevertheless, did widen the horizon of Slavic literature and greatly contribute to the enrichment of the Slavic vocabulary.<sup>72</sup> In the original parts of his work, such as the preface to his translation of John of Damascus and the epilogue to his *Hexaemeron* in praise of the glories of Symeon's court at Preslav, he displays considerable literary talent.<sup>73</sup>

Of the remaining Preslav authors who can be identified by name, Presbyter Gregory is credited with the translation of the *Octateuch*, which, he informs us, was done for Symeon, the "book-loving prince."<sup>74</sup> Theodore (Tudor), son of Doks (Duks) and a cousin of the ruler himself, is also represented, although only by a small prologue of his own.<sup>75</sup> On the other hand, an author of considerable originality was the monk Khrabr the Courageous, whom scholars have thus far unconvincingly attempted to identify as Clement, Nahum, John the Exarch, or even Symeon himself.<sup>76</sup> Khrabr's spirited apology of the Slavic alphabet and letters, already mentioned in another context, is a remarkable document springing directly from the Slavic ideology of Cyril and Methodius. Like the Slavic apostles, Khrabr, in his defense of the Slavic language, insists that Slavic is equal to Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, languages which appeared on the Saviour's cross and were sanctified by use in the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. He also preaches the equality of all languages, and argues that if Slavic has no ancient alphabet, it is all the better, because it was created by a single holy man, whereas the Greek script was the work of many heathen persons. It is interesting to note that Khrabr's treatise is obviously addressed to the sophisticated reader, thus indicating the existence of such an audience in Symeon's Bulgaria. Furthermore, the author reveals an impressive knowledge of Byzantine literature and classical lore. His knowledge is especially evident in the account of the develop-

<sup>71</sup> *Bogoslovie sv. Ioanna Damaskina*, 1.

<sup>72</sup> V. Vondrak, *O mluvě Jana Exarcha Bulgarského* (Prague, 1896); A. Leskien, "Die Übersetzungskunst des Exarchen Johannes," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 25 (1903), 48ff.; *idem*, "Zum Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes," *ibid.*, 26 (1904), 1ff.

<sup>73</sup> For the original parts in the translation of John of Damascus, see V. Jagić, "Rassuždenija južnoslavjanskoy i russkoj stariny o cerkovno-slavjanskem jazyke," *Issledovaniya po russkomu jazyku*, I (St. Petersburg, 1885-95), 320-4. For the epilogue to the *Hexaemeron*, see N. Mavrodič, "Opisanieto na Preslav v Šestodneva na Ioan Ekzarch," *Istoričeski pregled*, 11 (1955), 95ff.; K. Mijatović, "Dva poetičeski fragmenta i Ioan Ekzarch kato istoriceski izvori," *Archeologija*, 1 (1959), 1-2.

<sup>74</sup> I. E. Evseev, "Grigorij Presviter, perevodčik vremeni bolgarskoto cara Simeona," *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imper. Akademii nauk*, 7 (1902), 356-66; Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 299-303.

<sup>75</sup> V. Zlatarski, "Koj e bil Tudor černorizec Doksov?," *Bulgarski pregled*, 4, no. 3 (1897), 42-63; Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 330-3.

<sup>76</sup> On Khrabr and his treatise on the Slavic letters (*O pismeněch*), there is an extensive bibliography. The most recent studies are: Georgiev, *op. cit.*, 304-29; V. Velčev, "Černorizec Chrabr," *Istorija na būlgarska literatura*, I, 141-53, 429-30; K. Kuev, "Dva novi prepisa na Chrabrovo sūčinenie," *Izvestija na Institut za istorija*, 10 (1962), 225-44; *idem*, "K istorii izdanija P. J. Šafarikom skazanija černorizca Chrabra 'O pis'menach,'" *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 19 (1963), 448-51; A. Dostál, "Les origines de l'apologie slave par Chrabr," *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963), 236-46; I. I. Snegarev, "Černorizec Chrabr," *Chiljada i sto godini na slavjanska pismenost*, 305-19; F. Tkadlčík, "Le moine Chrabr et l'origine de l'écriture slave," *Byzantinoslavica*, 25 (1964), 75-92.

ment of the Greek alphabet, so strikingly similar, as Professor Dostál has demonstrated, to Byzantine scholia on the *Ars Grammatica* by Dionysius of Thrace.<sup>77</sup>

The work of known authors constitutes only a very small portion of the enormous Bulgarian literary output stemming from the time of Symeon and the other tsars of the First Empire. The rest of the literature, drawn exclusively from Greek prototypes, consists of numerous anonymous translations and compilations in the true Byzantine fashion of the tenth century.<sup>78</sup> And the guiding principles in the choice of the Slav translators were the needs of the recently converted Bulgarian people.

It was natural, therefore, that works of a liturgical and theological nature would occupy the most prominent position among these translations and compilations. The new faith also required for its confirmation and defense collections of canonical acts,<sup>79</sup> as well as exegetic commentaries on the Bible and the works of the Church Fathers.<sup>80</sup> Within the patristic literature there is a marked preference for the Fathers of the great period of the fourth and fifth centuries. Their works appeared time and again in a variety of forms: translations of complete works, excerpts and fragments, or simply free adaptations. It is in this manner that works such as the ascetic treatises of Basil the Great,<sup>81</sup> the homilies of John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus,<sup>82</sup> the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>83</sup> and the writings of a pleiad of lesser stars, found their way into the common Orthodox Slavic literary patrimony. To this list one could also add Ephrem the Syrian, whose artistic spirit, no effaced by the double translation, thereafter exercised great authority among the Slavs.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>77</sup> Dostál, *loc. cit.*, 241 ff.

<sup>78</sup> Murko, *op. cit.*, 72 ff.; I. Dujčev, "Medieval Slavic Literature and its Byzantine Background," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochride 1961; Rapports complémentaires résumés* (Belgrade-Ohrid, 1961), 83 ff.; *idem*, "Prevodna knižnina," 154-63, 430.

<sup>79</sup> On the legal treatises known to mediaeval Bulgaria, see A. Soloviev, "L'influence du droit byzantin dans les pays orthodoxes," *Relazioni del X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche*, VI (Rome, 1955), 599-650; *idem*, "Der Einfluß des byzantinischen Rechts auf die Völker Osteuropas," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Romanische Abteilung*, 67 (1959), 432-79; *idem*, "Oströmischs Vulgarrecht, byzantinisches, balkanisches und slavisches Recht," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochride 1961, Rapports complémentaires résumés* (Belgrade-Ohrid, 1961), 107-8. Cf. Dujčev, *loc. cit.*, 96; Mošin, *loc. cit.*, 40; M. Andreev, "V Makedonija li e bil suzdaden *Zakon Sudnyj Ljud'ni* i slavjanskijat púrvoučitel Metodij?," *Chiljada i sto godini na slavjanska pismenost*, 321-37, where the various theories of the origin of the *Zakon Sudnyj Ljudem* are reviewed.

<sup>80</sup> For the Slavic versions of exegetic commentaries and the works of the Church Fathers in general, see Archangel'skij, *op. cit.*, I-IV (Kazan', 1888-90); M. Heppel, "Slavonic Translations of Early Byzantine Ascetical Literature; A Bibliographical Note," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1954), 86-100; Dujčev, "Medieval Slavic Literature," 86 ff.

<sup>81</sup> P. A. Lavrov and A. Vaillant, "Les Règles de saint Basile en vieux slave: les Feuilles du Zograph," *Revue des études slaves*, 10 (1930), 5-35; A. Vaillant, *De Virginitate de saint Basile; Texte vieux slave et traduction française* (Paris, 1943). Some scholars, however, consider the latter treatise to be the work of Basil of Ancyra. See J. Quasten, *Patrology*, III (Utrecht, 1960), 203.

<sup>82</sup> A. S. Budilovič, *XIII slov Grigorija Bogoslova v drevneslavjanskem perevode* (St. Petersburg, 1875); A. Koníř, "Homilie Jana Zlatoustého o Herodiadě ve Sborníku Svatoslavově z r. 1073," *Byzantinoslavica*, 1 (1929), 182-206, where further bibliography is given. Cf. *supra*, note 59.

<sup>83</sup> A. Vaillant, "La traduction vieux-slave des Catéchèses de Cyrille de Jérusalem," *Byzantinoslavica*, 4 (1932), 253 ff.

<sup>84</sup> *Idem*, "Le Saint Ephrem slave," *ibid.*, 19 (1958), 279-86; cf. Archangel'skij, *op. cit.*, I, 46-53; D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, "L'Ephrem grec et la littérature slave," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochride 1961, Actes*, II (Belgrade, 1964), 343-6.

From the classics of Byzantine spirituality the Ladder of Paradise by John Climacus<sup>85</sup> and the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschus<sup>86</sup> enjoyed wide popularity, while an abundant hagiographical literature reached Bulgaria in the form of menologia and simple synaxaria.<sup>87</sup> Byzantine apocryphal literature enjoyed a unique popularity in Bulgaria from the tenth century on, and it soon spread widely among the other Orthodox Slavs; as if this literature answered Slavic longing for mythology in Christian disguise rather than for dogma. In Bulgaria, this literature played a peculiar role, for it became associated with the heretical Bogomils and served as a source for the literature of their movement.<sup>88</sup> It was this movement which provoked the Bulgarian apologetic Discourse Against the Recent Heresy of Bogomil by Cosmas the Presbyter.<sup>89</sup>

Far less numerous were the works translated from Byzantine secular literature. In contrast to the works of an ecclesiastical and theological character, the amount of secular literature, as far as we can judge on the basis of the surviving manuscripts, was very small indeed. Popular romances and tales were translated,<sup>90</sup> and there also appeared works of scientific or pseudo-scientific content, such as the Physiologus,<sup>91</sup> various astrological texts,<sup>92</sup> and Meletius' Treatise on Human Nature, included in the Hexaemeron of John the Exarch.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>85</sup> Archangel'skij, *op. cit.*, 88–90; M. Heppel, "Some Slavonic Manuscripts of the 'Scala Paradisi' ('Lestvica')," *Byzantinoslavica*, 18 (1957), 233–70.

<sup>86</sup> N. van Wijk, "Die slavische Redaktion des Μέγα Λειμωνάριον," *Byzantinoslavica*, 4 (1932), 236–52; *idem*, "Einige Kapitel aus Joannes Moschos in zwei kirchen Slavischen Übersetzungen," *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 10 (1933), 60–6.

<sup>87</sup> Murko, *op. cit.*, 73; I. Dujčev, "Les rapports entre l'hagiographie bulgare et l'hagiographie byzantine au moyen âge," *Sixième Congrès international d'études byzantines*, Alger, 2–7 octobre 1939, *Résumés des rapports et communications* (Paris, 1940), 152–3; *idem*, "Perevodna knižnina," 156. See also R. Aitzemüller, "Die altblgarische Übersetzung der Vita s. Pauli Simplicis," *Die Welt der Slaven*, 5 (1960), 225–32.

<sup>88</sup> I. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofia, 1925). Cf. A. I. Jacimirskij, *Bibliografičeskiy obzor apokrifov v južnoslavjanskoy i russkoj pis'mennosti; Spisi pamjatnikov*, I (Petrograd, 1921), 1–75; E. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 138 (1949), 22–52; 139 (1950), 176–218; *idem*, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumaines: leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Studi bizantini e neolenici*, 8 (1953), 47–52; B. Angelov, "Aporifi," *Istorija na būlg. literatura*, 178–92, 431–2; V. Velčev, "Bogomilskata knižnina," *ibid.*, 208–20, 432–3.

<sup>89</sup> H. Ch. Puech and A. Vaillant, *Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre* (Paris, 1945). Cf. V. Velčev, "Prezviter Kozma," *Istorija na būlgarskata literatura*, I, 221–40, 433–4; Cl. Backvis, "Un témoignage bulgare du X<sup>e</sup> siècle sur les Bogomiles: le 'Slovo' de Cosmas le Prêtre," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, 16 (1963), 75–100.

<sup>90</sup> For bibliographical information on the Slavic versions of the romance 'Barlaam and Josaphat,' see A. A. Nazarevskij, *Bibliografija drevnerusskoj povedi* (Moscow–Leningrad, 1955), 61–85. For the Alexander romance, the Stephanites and Ichnilates romance, and the Tale of Aesop, see Ju. Ivanov, *Starobūlgarski razkazi* (Sofia, 1935), 149–74, 273–89; 134–43, 289–97; 103–7, 245–9. Cf. Murko, *op. cit.*, 95–100; P. Dinekov, "Razkazi i povedi," *Istorija na būlgarsk. literatura*, I, 164–71, 430–1. A. Dostál ("Několik poznámek k jazyku slovanské; Staroruské verze byzantského eposu o Digenisovi Akritovi," *Rusko-české studie, Jazyk a literatura*, II [1960], 391–404) has detected South Slavic elements also in the Slavic version of Digenes Acrites, but he dates them from the twelfth century.

<sup>91</sup> Dujčev, *Estestvoznanieto*, 158–81, 572–4. Cf. M. N. Speranskij, "K istorii 'Fiziologa' v staroj bolgarskoj pis'mennosti," in his *Iz istorii russko-slavjanskich literaturnych svjazej* (Moscow, 1960), 148–59.

<sup>92</sup> I. Dujčev, "Gadaene po knigi v srednovekovieto," *Izvestija na Narodinija etnografski muzej*, 14 (1943), 49–55; *idem*, *Estestvoznanieto*, 390–437, 496.

<sup>93</sup> A. Leskién, "Der aristotelische Abschnitt in Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes," *Jagič-Festschrift* (Berlin, 1908), 97–111; Ju. Trifonov, "Ioan Ekzarch Būlgarski i opisanieto mu na čoveškoto tjalo," *Būlgarski pregled*, I (1929), 174 ff. Cf. Dujčev, *Estestvoznanieto*, 138 ff., 570 ff.

One could add here also the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes which apparently was translated into Slavic for the first time in Bulgaria during the tenth century.<sup>94</sup> But on the whole, the learned literature of Byzantium remained inaccessible to mediaeval Bulgaria. From the rich historical literature of the Byzantines, only the chronicles attracted the attention of the Slav translators.<sup>95</sup> Thus, we possess versions of the chronicles of John Malalas,<sup>96</sup> Patriarch Nicephorus,<sup>97</sup> and George Syncellus,<sup>98</sup> dating from the period of the First Bulgarian Empire. But as far as we know, none of the numerous historians of the learned tradition were ever rendered into Slavic, even though authors such as Procopius, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and Leo the Deacon dealt directly with the history of the Slavs.

Responsibility for this situation must be placed upon the exclusively church-oriented attitude of the Bulgarian literary circles. This attitude also explains the absence of translations from, or commentaries on, classical Greek literature, which witnessed a revival in Byzantium at that time, and was known not only in the literatures of the other neighboring Christian peoples, but also in that of the Moslems.<sup>99</sup> Moreover, the case of Bulgaria appears somewhat paradoxical if we recall Liudprand of Cremona, who informs us that Symeon, during his long sojourn in Photius' Byzantium, became a proficient Greek scholar with a taste for the rhetoric of Demosthenes and the syllogisms of Aristotle.<sup>100</sup> Thus, Symeon was sometimes known as the Hemi-Argus, the half-Greek, and his three surviving letters to Leo Choerosphactes are written in Greek and in the best tradition of Byzantine epistolography.<sup>101</sup> Yet, as far as we can ascertain, Bulgaria's knowledge of the classical world and its literature was not acquired at first hand, but rather through the channels of patristic and Byzantine literature.

The literature which developed in Bulgaria in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries, limited though it was with regard to originality and secular

<sup>94</sup> Dujčev, *Estestvoznanieto*, 438–95; *idem*, "Medieval Slavic Literature," 90. For scientific knowledge in mediaeval Bulgaria in general, see Kristanov and Dujčev, *Estestvoznanieto, passim*; I. Dujčev, "Zaraždane na naučnata misl u svednovekovna Būlgarija," *Archeologija*, 5, no. 2 (1963), 10–15; *idem*, "Racionalističeski problijasuci u slavjanskoto srednovekovie," *Istor. pregled*, 19, no. 5 (1963), 86–100.

<sup>95</sup> M. Weingart, *Byzantské kroniky v literatúre cirkevněslavanské*, I–II (Bratislava, 1922–3). Cf. I. Dujčev, "Übersicht über die bulgarische Geschichtsschreibung," *Antike und Mittelalter in Bulgarien* (Berlin, 1960), 53–6.

<sup>96</sup> The Slavic version is based on a better Greek manuscript, not extant today. See Weingart, *op. cit.*, 18–51. Cf. Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, 329–34.

<sup>97</sup> See *supra*, note 64.

<sup>98</sup> Weingart, *op. cit.*, I, 52–55; Ju. Trifonov, "Vizantijskite chroniki v čírkovno-slavjanskata knižnina," *Izvestija na Istor. družestvo*, 6 (1924), 169–70, where it is argued that the Slavic version was made in Bulgaria during the tenth or eleventh century.

<sup>99</sup> Attempts to prove that, besides the Russian version, there existed a Bulgarian translation of Josephus Flavius' *De bello judaico*, and also of his Jewish Antiquities, have not been convincing so far. See I. Dujčev, "Oдно неясно место в древнерусском переводе Иосифа Флавия," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 16 (1960), 420ff.; B. Angelov, "Iosif Flavij u južnoslavjanskich literaturach," *ibid.*, 19 (1963), 256.

<sup>100</sup> Liudprandus, *Antapodosis*, III, 29, 6–7; *MGH, SS.*, III, 309; cf. I. Dujčev, "Klassisches Altertum im mittelalterlichen Bulgarien," *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, I (Berlin, 1962), 349–50.

<sup>101</sup> See the letters of Symeon in G. Kolias, *Léon Choerosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice* (Athens, 1939), 76ff. Cf. V. Beševliev, "Fragmente aus der Korrespondenz eines bulgarischen Humanisten im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert," *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, I, 335–42.

outlook, nevertheless served as the foundation for Bulgarian national culture throughout the centuries, and also contributed greatly to the cultural life of other peoples.

By enriching and developing the language created by the Slavic apostles, so that it could express even the most subtle thoughts, the Bulgarian authors and translators secured for it a privileged position beside Greek and Latin as a literary language in mediaeval Europe.<sup>102</sup> This Old Church Slavic language (or as it is sometimes termed with certain justice, Old Bulgarian) became the vehicle of literary expression for all the Orthodox Slavs. It remained such in a revised form until the end of the eighteenth century, and has survived as the liturgical language of the Slavic Orthodox Church. And when the vernacular idioms of the Southern and Eastern Slavs emerged, it was under the direct influence of Old Church Slavic that they attained literary maturity.

A still greater achievement of the Bulgarians consisted in preserving intact the Cyrillo-Methodian precepts, while at the same time freely assimilating the culture of Byzantium, and subsequently disseminating the resulting synthesis among the Serbs, the Rumanians, and the Russians. By their example as well as by their activity, the Bulgarians fostered the growth of other national cultures along similar lines.

The Serbs were the first to feel the effects of the Slavic vernacular culture emanating from the Bulgarian lands. The partial evangelization of the Serbs under the Emperor Heraclius had had no lasting effects,<sup>103</sup> and Christianity reached this people in permanent form only in the second half of the ninth century. It was during the reign of the Emperor Basil I, when Byzantine Christianity had triumphed in Bulgaria, that it also began to penetrate other Southern Slavic regions. The imperial fleet's liberation of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) from an Arab blockade in 867 re-established Byzantine authority on the Dalmatian coast. Political influence was soon followed by a rapid spread of Christianity from Byzantium, and Byzantine influence even won a temporary victory over the ascendancy of the Frankish kingdom and the Roman Church in Croatia.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>102</sup> Dostál, "Die Widerspiegelung," 36ff.; *idem*, "Staroslověnský jazyk, jeho strukturní charakteristika a lokální typy," *Československé přednášky po V. mezinárodní sjed slavistů v Sofii* (Prague, 1963), 11ff. Cf. M. Weingart, "Le vocabulaire du vieux-slave dans ses relations avec le vocabulaire grec," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 5 (1939), 645-77; K. Schumann, *Die griechischen Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altbulgarischen* (Wiesbaden, 1958); I. Dujčev, "Les Slaves et Byzance," *Études historiques à l'occasion de XI<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des sciences historiques, Stockholm - Août 1960* (Sofia, 1960), 55-6.

<sup>103</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, XXII, 27ff. (ed. and tr. by Gy. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins [Budapest, 1949], 155). Cf. B. Ferjančić, *Vizantiski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, II (Belgrade, 1959), 40ff.; F. Dvornik, in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio; Commentary* (London, 1962), 133; P. I. Rămureanu, "Începutul creștinării Sârbilor sub împăratul bizantin Heraclius," *Studii teologice*, S. II, 11 (1959), 164-81.

<sup>104</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *op. cit.*, XXIX, 70ff. (Moravcsik and Jenkins, 126). Cf. G. Sp. Radojičić, "La date de la conversion des Serbes," *Byzantium*, 22 (1952), 253-6, where it is argued that the Christianization occurred between 867 and 874; Ferjančić, *op. cit.*, 16; Dvornik, *loc. cit.*, 103; Dujčev, *loc. cit.*, 44; *idem*, "Une ambassade byzantine auprès des Serbes au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta*, 7 (1961), 53-60; P. I. Rămureanu, "La conversion des Serbes sous l'empereur Basil I le Macédonien" (in Rumanian), *Studii teologice*, S. II, 12 (1960), 13-28 (known to me only from a reference in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 54 [1961], 204).

Slavic Christianity, however, came from Bulgaria to Serbia only in a later period, and must have grown in influence during the reign of Symeon of Bulgaria, whose supremacy had been recognized by the Serbian prince Mutimir.<sup>105</sup> Theories about an earlier and more direct penetration of Slavic Christianity from Moravia or Pannonia remain mere suppositions.<sup>106</sup> The introduction of the Slavic liturgy in Serbian lands was followed by the appearance of the Ohrid Glagolitic tradition, but it is difficult to establish the existence of independent local literary activity in Serbian lands in the early period, although one should not exclude the possibility that it could have existed.<sup>107</sup>

Slavic literature did witness a great flowering in Serbia, but this was during the later Middle Ages, when Serbian political power grew under the Nemanja dynasty. Having assimilated Latin influences from the Dalmatian coast, this literature emerged with a more original form and content than that found in the literary monuments of Bulgaria, although it remained equally faithful to the principles of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition.<sup>108</sup> The most striking example of this originality is the series of biographies we possess of secular Serbian personalities.

In Bosnia and Croatia, meanwhile, the influence of the Ohrid school met a sister Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. The place of the Croatian lands in the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition is both peculiar and complex.<sup>109</sup> The view that an indigenous Slavic liturgy had developed here before the Moravian mission is an ingenious theory which, however, lacks substantial proof.<sup>110</sup> The Slavic liturgy most probably had spread widely from Moravia and Pannonia into Croatia before the death of Methodius. Following the events of 885 and the destruction of the Great Moravian Empire by the Magyars, the position of this liturgy was strengthened in Croatia with the arrival of the persecuted disciples of Cyril and Methodius.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>105</sup> Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 12–13.

<sup>106</sup> Dj. Sp. Radojičić, "Medieval Slavic Literature and Its Byzantine Background," *XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Ochride 1961, Rapports complémentaires résumés* (Belgrade-Ohrid, 1961), 101; *idem*, "Kniževnost vizantijska i književnosti slovenske," *Glas Srpske Akademije nauka i umetnosti*, 250 (1961), 161ff.; *idem*, *Razvojni luk stare srpske književnosti* (Novi Sad, 1962), 11; *idem*, "Jugoslovenska srednjevekovna književnost," *Zbornik Matice Srpske za knjiž. i jezik*, 11 (1963), 17ff.

<sup>107</sup> The view that a literary school existed in the territory between Kossovo and Rila is held by Dj. Sp. Radojičić, *Antologija stare srpske književnosti* (Belgrade, 1960), 5; *idem*, *Razvojni luk*, 12ff.

<sup>108</sup> Murko, *op. cit.*, 133ff.; cf. *idem*, "Über Werke okzidentalner Herkunft in der mittelalterlichen Litteratur der Südslaven," *Deuxième Congrès international des études byzantines, Belgrade 1927* (Belgrade, 1929), 150–2; A. Schmaus, "Zur Frage der Kulturorientierung der Serben im Mittelalter," *Südost-Forschungen*, 15 (1956), 194–201; N. Banašević, "Odjeci Zapada u srpskoj književnosti srednjeg veka," *Živi jezici*, 1–2 (1957), 5–14; Radojičić, "Književnost," 161ff.; *idem*, "Istočna i zapadna komponenta starih južnoslovenskih književnosti," *Glas*, 256 (1963), 1–20.

<sup>109</sup> V. Jagić, "Hrvatska glagoljska književnost," in B. Vodnik, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti*, I (Zagreb, 1913), 9–64; K. Horálek, "Kofeny charvatsko-hlaholského písmnictví," *Slavia*, 19 (1950), 285–92; P. Skok, "Uslovi života glagoljice," *Slovo*, 3 (1953), 50–63; A. Cronia, "Delle così detta letteratura glagolitica e del periodo della sua maggiore floridezza," *Ricerche slavistiche*, 3 (1954), 123–32; J. Hamm, "Der Glagolismus in mittlerem Balkanraum," *Die Welt der Slaven*, 1 (1956), 265–75; *idem*, "Glagolizam," 313–21; *idem*, "Glagolica," 462–8; St. Smržík, *The Glagolitic or Roman-Slavonic Liturgy* (Cleveland, Ohio-Rome, 1959); Mošin, "O periodizaciji," 56; V. Stefanić, "Tisuću i sto godina od moravske misije," *Slovo*, 13 (1963), 5–42.

<sup>110</sup> This unsubstantiated view has been recently advocated anew by D. Mandić, *Rasprave i prilozi iz stare hrvatske povijesti* (Rome, 1963), 390ff.

<sup>111</sup> *Vita Nahum*, in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, 307; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *op. cit.*, XLI (Moravcsik and Jenkins, 181).

Thus, one finds in Croatia a situation analogous to that in Bulgaria. In Croatia, however, the tradition of Cyril and Methodius came into direct contact with Latin Christianity, whereas in Bulgaria it met with its Byzantine counterpart. This difference was the basis for subsequent divergent development. Furthermore, in Bulgaria it was the desire of the ruler to create a national Church that facilitated the growth of Slavic liturgy and letters. The Croat rulers had recently recovered their independence and already possessed a Slavic bishopric at Nin; so one would have expected them to favor the Slavic liturgy—if for no other reason than that the liturgy would serve as a means of national appeal to the Croats living between the Drava and Sava rivers, who were still under Frankish rule. Motivated, rather, by their ambition to control the wealthy commercial cities on the Dalmatian coast, they acted otherwise.<sup>112</sup> When hard pressed by the armies of Symeon of Bulgaria, the Byzantines, masters of this littoral, found an eager ally in Tomislav, the first king of the Croats. In exchange, Tomislav was entrusted with the administration of the Dalmatian coast, which was, however, ecclesiastically under the jurisdiction of Rome.

In order to win the support of the new territories, then, the Croat ruler sided with Rome and the Latin bishop of Split. In opposition to the latter's attempts to bring the Slavic bishopric of Nin under his direct jurisdiction and to stamp out the Slavic liturgy, Gregory, the great bishop of Nin, raised strong objections. Thus, whether or not we accept the authenticity of the tenth canon of the Synod of Split, held in 925, forbidding the ordination of new priests for the Slavic liturgy, the fact remains that neither Rome nor the Croat princes favored the Slavic liturgy. Rome apparently had no use for this liturgy once the Byzantine danger was over.<sup>113</sup>

But what assured the survival of the Slavic liturgy in Croatia was the force and vitality of the Cyrillo-Methodian ideology, which transformed it into a symbol of national identity and resistance to Latinization. The position of this liturgy was further strengthened by the timely intervention of a legend that Saint Jerome, a Roman Church Father and a son of Dalmatia, had created the Glagolitic alphabet and had introduced the Slavic tongue into the liturgy.<sup>114</sup>

The Slavic liturgy and letters in Croatia retained through the centuries the use of the Glagolitic alphabet, although in a more angular form, apparently under the influence of the Beneventan script.<sup>115</sup> Traces of Croatian contacts with the Ohrid tradition are evident, but in the early centuries the main contacts of Croatian Glagolism were with Bohemia, as is indicated by the

<sup>112</sup> F. Šišić, *Geschichte der Kroaten*, I (Zagreb, 1917), 108 ff.; F. Dvornik, *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization* (Boston, 1956), 134, 174-6.

<sup>113</sup> J. Srebrnić, "Odnošaji pape Ivana X prema Bizantu i Slavenima na Balkanu," *Zbornik Kralja Tomislava* (Zagreb, 1925), 128-64.

<sup>114</sup> See the Croatian Life of Saint Jerome in *Starine Jugosl. Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, I (1869), 236. Cf. Jagić, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 130-1; V. Novak, "Jeronim," *Narodna enciklopedija*, II (Belgrade, n. d.), 155-6.

<sup>115</sup> V. Novak, *Scriptura beneventiana s osobitom obzirom na tip dalmatinske beneventane* (Zagreb, 1920), 62, 66; *idem*, "Slavonic-Latin Symbiosis," 9.

reception of the Life of Saint Wenceslas, and the introduction of the first Czech saints into the Croatian Church calendar.<sup>116</sup> This debt was partially repaid in the fourteenth century, when Croatian *glagoljaši* brought the interrupted tradition of the Slavic liturgy back to Bohemia under Charles IV, and established it in the "Slavic Monastery" of Emmaus which he had founded in the New City of Prague.<sup>117</sup>

In spite of the fact that it had a continuous struggle for existence, Glagolism in Croatia did not remain restricted to liturgical usage alone. It was also used in everyday life, as we can ascertain from a number of eleventh-century Glagolitic inscriptions found on the Dalmatian coast and islands.<sup>118</sup> Glagolism also produced a considerable literature, which became the basis of subsequent Croatian vernacular literary development.<sup>119</sup> The Croatian Glagolitic tradition with its Roman orientation has sustained a meager life to this day in the Dalmatian territory, retaining the spirit of the ideology of the Slavic apostles, but otherwise completely separated from the course which the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition took in the other Southern Slavic countries.

The Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in its Bulgarian form crossed the Danube river in the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula and spread Slavic Christianity to the territory that was later to be formed into the Rumanian principalities. Thus, Rumania made its spiritual and literary beginnings as a province of Slavic vernacular culture.<sup>120</sup> Determining the exact date of these beginnings is as difficult a problem as ascertaining the enigmatic origin of the Rumanians themselves. We find no traces of Slavic literary activity north of the Danube until the latter part of the fourteenth century, and yet we are convinced that Slavic Christianity must have spread there at a much earlier date. This conclusion is dictated by philological and archaeological evidence, and by the strong possibility that at times the Bulgarian frontier in the ninth and tenth centuries extended north of the Danube.<sup>121</sup> Furthermore, the penetration of

<sup>116</sup> Horálek, "Kořeny," 285-92; J. Hamm, "Vom kroatischen Typus des Kirchenslavischen," *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 10 (1963), 15-18. Cf. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, 174.

<sup>117</sup> M. Kostić, "Zašto je osnovan slovensko-glagoljaški manastir Emaus u Pragu," *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva*, 2 (1927), 159-65; M. Paulová, "L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne dans la politique de Charles IV et la fondation du monastère slave de Prague," *Byzantinoslavica*, 11 (1950), 174-86; cf. Jakobson, "The Kernel," 54; Fr. Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1962), 160.

<sup>118</sup> J. Hamm, "Datiranje glagoljskih tekstova," *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta*, 1 (1952), 5-72.

<sup>119</sup> Jagić, "Hrvatska glagolska književnost," 3-5; A. Vaillant, "Les origines de la langue littéraire ragusaine," *Revue des études slaves*, 4 (1924), 231ff.

<sup>120</sup> I. Bărbulescu, "L'origine des plus anciens mots et institutions slaves des Roumains," *Jubileen sbornik v čest' na S. S. Bobțev* (Sofia, 1921), 207-19; G. Nandriș, "The Beginnings of Slavonic Culture in the Rumanian Countries," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 24 (1946), 160-71; E. Turdeanu, *Les Principautés Roumaines et les Slaves du Sud: Rapports littéraires et religieux* (Munich, 1959); St. Stefanescu, "Rumynobolgarskie svjazi v IX-XIV vv. i stanovlenie rumynskoj gosudarstvennosti," *Romanoslavica*, 9 (1963), 531-42. For the penetration of the Slavic vernacular tradition in Transylvania, see P. Olteanu, "Origines de la culture slave dans la Transylvanie du Nord et le Maramureș," *Romanoslavica*, 1 (1958), 169-97; cf. C. Nicolescu, "Considérations sur l'ancienneté des monuments roumains de Transylvanie," *Revue roumaine d'histoire*, 1 (1962), 411-26.

<sup>121</sup> G. Nandriș, "The Earliest Contacts Between Slavs and Rumanians," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 19 (1939-40), 142-5; *idem*, "The Development and Structure of Rumanian," *ibid.*, 30 (1951-2), 7-39; A. Rosetti, *Înfluența limbilor slave meridionale asupre limbii române (sec. VI-XII)* (Bucharest, 1954). See also A. Grecu (P. P. Panaiteanu), "Bulgaria în nordul Dunării în veacurile al

Slavic Christianity during the period of the First Bulgarian Empire seems particularly likely if we recall the lively intercourse which existed during the tenth and eleventh centuries between Bulgaria and Kievan Russia.<sup>122</sup>

The Second Bulgarian Empire with its large Vlach element must definitely have strengthened Slavic Christianity in the trans-Danubian region, but its systematic organization probably dates from the fourteenth century, when the independent principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia were formed.<sup>123</sup> Only then are we informed that the Slavic tongue was used not only for liturgical purposes, but also as the official language of the state. The influence of Bulgarian literature was so deeply rooted in the Rumanian lands that local literary activity continued to foster Slavic letters long after they had declined among the Balkan Slavs under Ottoman rule. Wallachia and Moldavia thereby became important centers of an adopted Slavic culture, and, in turn, they made both the Southern and the Eastern Slavs their debtors by returning to them Slavic literature, both in manuscript and printed form, as late as the seventeenth century.<sup>124</sup>

Slavic literature and the Cyrillo-Methodian ideology were so thoroughly assimilated in Rumania that they became the foundation of the national tradition and the basis for later cultural development. In this connection it is significant that when Phanariote influence penetrated these lands in the seventeenth century as a kind of prelude to its later rule, Cyrillic letters emerged as a symbol of opposition to the foreigners.<sup>125</sup> Not until the national revival in the nineteenth century, with its Latin inspiration, were the concrete manifestations of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition lost. And even then, when the Cyrillic alphabet had been completely replaced by the Latin, the spirit of the legacy of the Slavic apostles remained intact.

The last, but nevertheless the greatest, beneficiaries of the tradition of Cyril and Methodius in its Bulgarian form were the Russians. Following the

IX-lea—X-lea," *Studi și cercetări de istorie medie*, I (1950), 223–36; M. Comșa, "Die bulgarische Herrschaft des Donau während des X Jh. im Lichte der archäologischen Forschungen," *Dacia*, N. S., 4 (1960), 395–422; *Istoria României*, II (Bucharest, 1962), 179–87.

<sup>122</sup> M. N. Tichomirov, "Istoričeskie svjazi russkogo naroda s južnymi slavjanami s drevnejšich vremen do poloviny XVII v.," *Slavjanskij sbornik* ([Moscow] 1947), 136ff.; G. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven, 1948), 318ff.; V. Nikolaev, *Slavjanobulgarskij faktor v christijanizacijata na Kievskaja Rusija* (Sofia, 1949), 139ff.; I. Snegarov, *Duchovno-kulturni vrúzki meždu Búlgarija i Rusija prez srednite vekova (X–XVv.)* (Sofia, 1950), 1ff.

<sup>123</sup> N. Bănescu, *L'ancien État bulgare et les pays roumains* (Bucharest, 1947), 69–88; E. Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains* (Paris, 1947), *passim*; *idem*, *Les Principautés*, 2. Cf. R. L. Wolff, "The 'Second Bulgarian Empire': Its Origin and History to 1204," *Speculum*, 24 (1949), 167–206.

<sup>124</sup> A. I. Jacimirskij, *Iz istorii slavjanskoy pis'mennosti v Moldavii i Valachii* (Moscow, 1906); P. P. Panaitescu, "La littérature slavo-roumaine (XVe–XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles) et son importance pour l'histoire des littératures slaves," *Sbornik prací I. sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze 1929*, II (Prague, 1932), 206–17; E. Turdeanu, "Din vechile schimburi culturale dintre Români și Jugoslavi," *Cercetări literare*, 3 (1939), 141–218; Dj. Sp. Radojičić, "Srpsko-rumunski odnosi XIV–XVII v.," *Godišnjak Filozofskog Fakulteta u Novom Sadu*, I (1956), 13–29; St. Ciobanu, "Din legăturile culturale româno-ucrainene," *Academia Română, Memoriile Secțiunii literare*, S. III, 8 (1938), 35ff.; *Relații româno-ruse din trecut* (Bucharest, 1957); *Studii privind relațiile româno-ruse și româno-sovietice* (Bucharest, 1958); V. Ciobanu, "Relații literare româno-ruse în epoca feudală," *Studii și cercetări de istorie literară și folclor*, 9 (1960), 294ff.

<sup>125</sup> Nandriș, "The Beginnings," 160.

conversion of Prince Vladimir about 988, Christianity and the Slavic liturgy were officially established in the lands of Kiev. The Slavic language and letters which Kiev received from Bulgaria became the cornerstone of a rich literature and culture, and when Rus' lay broken under the Tatar yoke, this culture acted as a unifying force. Eventually, strengthened by a new wave of South Slavic influence in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition helped to inspire Muscovy in its task of "gathering" the Russian lands. And as Muscovy expanded in every direction, Slavic liturgy and Slavic letters, conceived originally for Moravia, found their way in Russian hands to the distant shores of the Pacific Ocean.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>126</sup> Tichomirov, *loc. cit.*, 162 ff.; Gudzij, "Literatura Kievskoj Rusi," 7-60; B. Angelov, "K voprosu o načale russko-bolgarskikh literaturnykh svjazej," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 14 (1958), 132-8.